

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP 07-06-s2)

Questions for Illiana RFP

Questions & Answers posted on 06-29-07

1. In accordance with the draft Public Private Partnership (P3) Conflict of Interest Guidelines available on the INDOT website, have the specific criteria been developed that would detail which consultants may be precluded from participating on any subsequent Illiana P3 Team?

ANSWER: At this time there has been no further criteria development beyond what is enumerated on the Draft COI that is posted. However, this Feasibility study is being made at a very preliminary stage for the ILLIANA EXPRESSWAY project. This information would be made available to all proposer teams in the event that a concession was sought in the future. Thus, according to the current COI, any information/data prepared or compiled by the Consultant/ Traffic and Revenue Consultant would be "available on an equal and timely basis to all Proposers" and fall within one of the posted exceptions to the Draft COI policy. Therefore, it is anticipated that the Consultant should not be constrained by the current Draft COI.

2. The links [http://www.in.gov/dot/pdf/COF/IllianaCFPPPhase2GrantApplication1of2 ... 20f2](http://www.in.gov/dot/pdf/COF/IllianaCFPPPhase2GrantApplication1of2...20f2) referenced on page 5 of the RFP do not lead to the desired documents

ANSWER: The referenced links to the Corridors of the Future Phase 2 Application were tested prior to being sent and directed the user to the intended documents. The ILLIANA EXPRESSWAY Phase 2 Application for the Corridors of the Future can be accessed directly from INDOT's website at: <http://www.in.gov/dot/>

3. The RFP seems to specifically exclude the feasibility of a public toll authority by limiting financial consideration to only public-private partnership. Is this the intent?

ANSWER: At this time INDOT is intending to determine the overall feasibility of developing the ILLIANA Expressway as a tolled facility, minimizing or entirely eliminating the need for State funding contributions. Therefore, any innovative financing opportunities would be of interest.

4. Does the Technical Approach Document need to be included both immediately following the Identification and Qualifications section and as Item 3 in the Key Staff and Project Approach section? Since the proposal must be organized in the same order listed as stated on page 8 of 11, this would create a proposal with 3 sections: Identification and Qualification; Technical Approach; and Key Staff and Project Approach. The first item in the Technical Approach would be repeated in the Key Staff and Project Approach section.

ANSWER: See revised RFP 07-06-s2 ("Requirements for Letters of Interest" on pages 8 & 9)

5. Should capacity of staff and their ability to perform the work in a timely manner be included as both Item 5 of Identification and Qualifications and Item 2 of Key Staff and Project Approach?

ANSWER: See revised RFP 07-06-s2 ("Requirements for Letters of Interest" on pages 8 & 9)

6. Archaeology is not listed as a work type in the RFP. Is this correct? A preliminary Records Check/Literature Review at this point would be beneficial to assist in meeting the 5th goal listed, evaluating the environmental situation in the region.

ANSWER: This is intended to be a preliminary feasibility study not a detailed NEPA investigation. The Consultant should review and compile all available GIS environmental data available from INDOT, Illinois DOT, CMAP, NIRPC, etc. and report and evaluate any project-endangering conditions. This work will not be directed at initiating any NEPA requirements, however, the data/information compiled could be used in future NEPA studies, if applicable.

7. Is information for subconsultants required on the Current and Completed Projects Form or the Active and Pending Contract and Balances form?

ANSWER: The information required on the Current and Completed Projects Forms pertains to the Lead\Prime firm only.

8. The RFP, it states that we include “contract responsibilities by work category” for the prime and subconsultants proposed. Could you please clarify what the work categories are? Are they the required prequalification categories’ work type listed on page 4 of the RFP or the work items identified in the scope of work?

ANSWER: The “contract responsibilities by work category” refer to those required prequalification categories listed on page 4 of the RFP.

9. The RFP, it states that “all text shall be black type”. Can figures and/or Graphics include any color or should they remain black type as well?

ANSWER: The “Requirements for Letters of Interest” have been revised. Color figures and/or Graphics are acceptable.

10. Please provide INDOT’s definition and expectations of a Level II and Level III Traffic & Revenue Analysis.

Under Scope of Services, Page 3 “Prepare a Level III T & R analysis for the Illiana Expressway within 90 days after initial NTP”. Should this be Level II?

Reference is made in the document to various levels of Traffic and Revenue (T&R) analyses. Is there a description of a Level II analysis vs. a Level III analysis, and no mention is made of a Level I analysis. These analyses may determine the teaming on the response.

The RFP asks for a Level III T&R analysis within 90 days of initial NTP. A Level III analysis is what is commonly called an “investment grade” study, and appears to be beyond the scope of this study. Is INDOT looking for a Level I analysis, commonly referred to as “exploratory” within 90 days? If so, what does INDOT plan to do with the information for the exploratory study? There is no mention of interim go/no-go decision points in the remainder of the RFP.

ANSWER: The wrong T & R Analysis level was cited in the RFP for the initial T & R evaluation. INDOT is requesting a SKETCH Level T & R ANALYSIS be conducted within 90 days after the Consultant is issued their notice-to-proceed (NTP).

A SKETCH Level T & R ANALYSIS would be a project specific estimate of costs, demand/traffic volumes, and revenues, as well as an evaluation of project specific alternatives, such as cross-section options, tolling strategies, etc.

Based on the results of this SKETCH Level T & R ANALYSIS, INDOT in consultation with the Consultant will determine if this is a viable P3 project.

The Level II T & R Analysis cited in the RFP would be an INTERMEDIATE/PRELIMINARY Level T & R ANALYSIS. The INTERMEDIATE Level T & R ANALYSIS would refine the toll traffic forecasts and revenue estimates, require validation of the travel demand models used and the economic development assumptions made, and address all appropriate requirements cited in the RFP.

No INVESTMENT GRADE T & R Analysis is required in this contract.